In rejecting these four claims, the Examiner relies upon the teachings of Onaga. The Examiner refers to column 4, lines 60-65, and column 6, lines 29-33, as evidence that Onaga teaches, among other elements, a file server that provides all of the status of the peripheral devices simultaneously to the plurality of work stations. However, Applicant submits that the recited sections of Onaga do not teach or suggest that the status information of a plurality of peripheral devices is simultaneously provided to a plurality of work stations. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Onaga teaches that status information from the peripheral devices is stored in a central location from which all work stations can obtain the status information. The Office Action further indicates that discovery need be performed only once for all intelligent peripheral devices and all work stations, and that after the file server provides the devices status information to the work stations, each work station can read the device status file and display the device status information. And, the device status files are preferably updated with sufficient frequency to provide the work stations. The Examiner then concludes that the file server provides all the status of the peripheral devices simultaneously to the work stations. However, none of the language quoted by the Examiner indicates that the status is provided simultaneously to the plurality of work stations.

Applicant submits that the system disclosed in Onaga is not capable of providing the status of each of the peripheral devices 110 to each of the work stations 150 simultaneously. In fact, from a review of Figures 2, 3A, and 3B of Onaga, it is clear that the process of sending the device status information from the file server 120 to the work station 150 is initiated by the work station 150 that requests the device status information.

Column 6, lines 31-33, indicates that a process preferably embodied as software is resident in each workstation 150 and is preferably provided for reading the device status file. There is no teaching or suggestion in Onaga that each of the workstations can or should request the status file simultaneously. Nevertheless, even in the unlikely event that a plurality of workstations simultaneously requested the status of the plurality of device files, the file server in Onaga would deliver the status file to each workstation sequentially in response to each request, like a plurality of unicasts.

In contrast to the teachings of Onaga, the print server of the present invention delivers the status to each computer simultaneously (claims 1, 11, 22) or at the same time (claim 35).

Accordingly, Onaga does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 11, 22, and 35.

Claim 13 depends from claim 11, and is thus also patentable over Onaga at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11.

Claims 4 and 14:

Claims 4 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga and U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135, hereinafter Webb. Claims 4 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively. The Examiner relies upon Webb for its alleged teaching of providing an optional object displayed in the window including the object for postponing a particular print job by user. Such teachings do not overcome the

deficiency of the rejection of claims 1 and 11 based on Onaga. Accordingly, the rejections

of claims 4 and 14 should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 15-16:

Claims 6 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Onaga and U.S. Patent No. 5,669,040, hereinafter Hisatake.

The Examiner relies upon Hisatake for its alleged teaching of the status monitor of

each of the plurality of computers including means for displaying an operating condition in

which a waiting time for the printer that is displayed in the status monitor. The teaching in

Hisatake relied upon by the Examiner does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of

claims 1 and 11, from which claims 6 and 15-16 depend. Accordingly, claims 6 and 15-16

are patentable over the combination of Onaga and Hisatake.

Claims 17-19:

Claims 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Onaga and U.S. Patent No. 6,213,652, hereinafter Suzuki. The Examiner alleges that

Suzuki teaches that the computers and the print server exchange registration request and

response information. However, such teachings do not overcome the deficiency of the

rejection of claim 11 based on Onaga. Accordingly, claims 17-19 are also patentable over

the combination of Onaga and Suzuki.

Claims 10, 21, and 23:

Claims 10, 21, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga, as applied to claims 1, 11, and 22, and JP Patent No. 409212313A, hereinafter JP '313. Claims 10, 21, and 23 depend from claims 1, 11, and 22, respectively. The Examiner relies upon JP '313 for its alleged teaching of the print server including means for calculating a waiting time for availability of a printer. However, this teaching does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of claims 1, 11, and 22, based on Onaga. Accordingly, claims 10, 21, and 23 are also patentable over the applied prior art.

Claims 27-39:

Claims 27-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Onaga and U.S. Patent No. 5,435,544, hereinafter Mandel.

The Examiner recognizes that Onaga does not teach "when the status of a printer changes". To make up for this deficiency, the Examiner relies upon column 1, lines 40-46, of Mandel. However, Mandel teaches that the status of a print job is sent to a particular computer that originated the print job in order to advise that particular computer when the print job is completed or if the printer is out of paper. There is no teaching or suggestion that the information in Mandel sent to a *plurality* of computers when the status of a printer changes. Accordingly, neither Onaga, nor Mandel, teach or suggest that the status of a printer is sent to a plurality of computers at any given time, particularly, when the status of the at least printer changes. At best, Mandel teaches that the status of a

printer is sent to a particular computer, not a plurality of computers, when a print job

originated by that particular computer reaches a particular status, such as completion or if

the printer is out of paper.

Accordingly, neither Onaga, nor Mandel, either by themselves or in combination,

teaches the subject matter of claim 27.

Claims 28 and 36 depend from claim 27, and are thus also patentable over the cited

prior art.

Claim 29 also defines sending the status of at least one printer to a plurality of

computers when the status of the at least one printer changes. Accordingly, for the reasons

set forth above with respect to claim 27, the rejection of claim 29 is also improper and

should be withdrawn.

Claims 30 and 37 depend from claim 29, and are thus also patentable over the

applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 27 and 29.

Claim 31 defines a print server which includes, among other elements, a sender for

sending the status to a plurality of computers without receiving a status request from any of

the plurality of computers. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this feature of

claim 31, other than to state that the limitation is the same as "a sender for sending the

status to the computers when the status of the at least one printer changes". However,

there is no basis for this comparison. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 31 is improper

and should be withdrawn. If the Examiner persists with the rejection of claim 31, the

Examiner is required to provide a proper analysis to which Applicant can respond.

Nevertheless, as set forth above, Mandel does not teach sending the status of a printer to a plurality of computers. Instead, Mandel merely sends the status to a particular computer which originated a print request.

Accordingly, claim 31 is patentable over the combination of Onaga and Mandel.

Claims 32 and 38 depend from claim 31, and are thus also patentable over the cited prior art.

With regard to claims 33, 34, and 39, similar issues reside, as with claim 31. Specifically, the subject matter of claim 33 has not been adequately addressed by the Examiner, and, Applicant submits that Mandel does not teach or suggest, either by itself, or in combination with Onaga, the sending of the status of at least one printer to a plurality of computers without any of the plurality of computers sending a status request. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 33, and dependent claims 34 and 39.

In addition, dependent claims 36, 37, 38, and 39 each include language relating to the fact that the status is sent to a plurality of computers simultaneously. With regard to the discussion set forth above with respect to claims 1, 11, and 22, the Examiner is also reminded that the prior art does not teach these features.

The Office Action sets forth additional analyses concerning the alleged teachings of the cited prior art. At the present time, Applicant does not take a position concerning such other analyses, and reserves the right to challenge such analyses at a later time if necessary and appropriate.